

UCLA/92/TEP/22

May 1992

Bounds from Stability and Symmetry Breaking on Parameters in the Two-Higgs-Doublet Potential

Boris Kastening¹*Department of Physics**University of California, Los Angeles**Los Angeles, California 90024*

Abstract

The most general $SU(2) \times U(1)_Y$ -symmetric quartic potential with two Higgs doublets, subject to an only softly broken discrete symmetry $(\phi_1, \phi_2) \rightarrow (-\phi_1, \phi_2)$, is considered. At tree-level, analytic bounds on the parameters are derived that ensure a stable vacuum, breaking $SU(2) \times U(1)_Y$ down to $U(1)_{\text{em}}$.

¹email: boris@ruunts.fys.ruu.nl

In the minimal standard model, spontaneous symmetry breaking of the $SU(2) \times U(1)_Y$ gauge symmetry down to $U(1)_{\text{em}}$ is caused by the potential of a single Higgs- $SU(2)$ doublet. However, since the exact symmetry breaking mechanism is not known, it is natural to consider extensions of the Higgs sector. The simplest such extension is to have another $SU(2)$ -doublet scalar field. In fact, there are many reasons to discuss the two-doublet model. For associated particle phenomenology, see e.g. [1, 2] and references therein. More recently, the model has also received attention in cosmological contexts, mainly in connection with baryogenesis in the early universe [3].

Assume we want to prescribe the minimum of the two-doublet potential as

$$\langle \Phi_1 \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \langle \Phi_2 \rangle = \frac{e^{i\rho}}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

which, up to gauge transformations, is the most general vacuum that breaks $SU(2) \times U(1)_Y$ down to $U(1)_{\text{em}}$. Then, up to an overall constant, the most general $SU(2) \times U(1)_Y$ -symmetric quartic potential involving two Higgs- $SU(2)$ doublets that is subject to an only softly (i.e. by dimension-two terms) broken discrete symmetry $(\phi_1, \phi_2) \rightarrow (-\phi_1, \phi_2)$ [equivalent to only soft breaking of $(\phi_1, \phi_2) \rightarrow (\phi_1, -\phi_2)$] and that makes (1) stationary, can be written as²

$$\begin{aligned} V(\Phi_1, \Phi_2) = & \lambda_1(\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_1 - \frac{v_1^2}{2})^2 + \lambda_2(\Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_2 - \frac{v_2^2}{2})^2 \\ & + \lambda_3[(\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_1 - \frac{v_1^2}{2}) + (\Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_2 - \frac{v_2^2}{2})]^2 \\ & + \lambda_4[(\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_1)(\Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_2) - (\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2)(\Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_1)] \\ & + \lambda_5[\text{Re}(\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2) - \frac{v_1 v_2}{2} \cos \rho]^2 + \lambda_6[\text{Im}(\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2) - \frac{v_1 v_2}{2} \sin \rho]^2 \\ & + \lambda_7[\text{Re}(\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2) - \frac{v_1 v_2}{2} \cos \rho][\text{Im}(\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2) - \frac{v_1 v_2}{2} \sin \rho]. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

The discrete symmetry imposed on the quartic terms is intended to suppress

²I am grateful to Howard Haber for pointing out to me the possibility of having the λ_7 -term.

neutral flavor-changing currents.

At this point we are free to make a phase redefinition of the Φ_i . Choosing $(\Phi_1, \Phi_2) \rightarrow (\Phi_1 e^{i\varphi}, \Phi_2)$ with φ satisfying

$$(\lambda_6 - \lambda_5) \sin(2\varphi) = \lambda_7 \cos(2\varphi), \quad (3)$$

we can write the potential again in the form (2), with the replacements

$$\lambda_7 \rightarrow 0, \quad (4)$$

$$\lambda_{5,6} \rightarrow \frac{\lambda_5 + \lambda_6}{2} \pm \frac{\lambda_5 - \lambda_6}{2 \cos 2\varphi} = \frac{\lambda_5 + \lambda_6}{2} \mp \frac{\lambda_7}{2 \sin 2\varphi}, \quad (5)$$

$$\rho \rightarrow \rho + \varphi. \quad (6)$$

Therefore we will assume $\lambda_7 = 0$ for the remainder of this paper, which leaves us with the potential given in [4, 1]. Since we want (1) to be the absolute minimum and because clearly $V = 0$ for Φ_1 and Φ_2 given by (1), our strategy will be to ask, for what values of $\lambda_{1,\dots,6}$ and ρ the potential is nonnegative for all Φ_1 and Φ_2 . After deriving necessary conditions for $V \geq 0$, we will show that they are also sufficient. We will assume throughout our calculation that $v_1, v_2 \neq 0$. If one of them vanishes, the analysis is much easier and leads to the same results.

Take

$$\Phi_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} -cv_2 \\ v_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Phi_2 = \frac{e^{i\rho}}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} cv_1 \\ v_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (7)$$

with c real. Then

$$V = \frac{1}{4} [\lambda_1 v_2^4 + \lambda_2 v_1^4 + \lambda_3 (v_1^2 + v_2^2)^2 + (\lambda_5 \cos^2 \rho + \lambda_6 \sin^2 \rho) v_1^2 v_2^2] c^4 + \frac{1}{4} \lambda_4 (v_1^2 + v_2^2)^2 c^2, \quad (8)$$

and we need

$$\lambda_4 \geq 0, \quad (9)$$

since otherwise $V < 0$ for sufficiently small but nonzero c^2 .

Take

$$\Phi_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Phi_2 = \frac{e^{-i\rho}}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ -v_2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (10)$$

to get

$$V = \lambda_5 v_1^2 v_2^2 \cos^2 \rho. \quad (11)$$

Therefore we need

$$\lambda_5 \geq 0 \quad (12)$$

if $\cos \rho \neq 0$. If $\cos \rho = 0$ take

$$\Phi_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Phi_2 = \frac{e^{i\epsilon}}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v_2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (13)$$

Defining $\delta \equiv |\sin \epsilon - \sin \rho|$ and using $\sin \rho = \pm 1$, we get

$$V = [2\lambda_5 \delta + (\lambda_6 - \lambda_5) \delta^2] \frac{v_1^2 v_2^2}{4}. \quad (14)$$

Again we need (12), since otherwise $V < 0$ for sufficiently small but nonzero δ .

Thus, for any ρ , (12) is necessary.

Take

$$\Phi_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Phi_2 = \frac{e^{-i\rho}}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v_2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (15)$$

to get

$$V = \lambda_6 v_1^2 v_2^2 \sin^2 \rho. \quad (16)$$

Therefore we need

$$\lambda_6 \geq 0 \quad (17)$$

if $\sin \rho \neq 0$. If $\sin \rho = 0$, take again ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 from (13). Defining $\delta \equiv |\cos \epsilon - \cos \rho|$

and using $\cos \rho = \pm 1$, we get

$$V = [2\lambda_6 \delta + (\lambda_5 - \lambda_6) \delta^2] \frac{v_1^2 v_2^2}{4}. \quad (18)$$

Again we need (17), since otherwise $V < 0$ for sufficiently small but nonzero δ . Thus, for any ρ , (17) is necessary.

Set alternatively $\Phi_2 = 0$ and $\Phi_1 = 0$. Vacuum stability, i.e. $V \geq 0$ for large fields, requires then

$$\lambda_1 + \lambda_3 \geq 0, \quad \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 \geq 0. \quad (19)$$

If both $\lambda_1 + \lambda_3 > 0$ and $\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 > 0$, take

$$\Phi_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\frac{\lambda_2 + \lambda_3}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_3} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Phi_2 = \frac{e^{i\rho}}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\frac{\lambda_1 + \lambda_3}{\lambda_2 + \lambda_3} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v_1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (20)$$

and get

$$V = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_3}{\sqrt{(\lambda_1 + \lambda_3)(\lambda_2 + \lambda_3)}} \right) \left(\sqrt{\lambda_2 + \lambda_3} v_2^2 - \sqrt{\lambda_1 + \lambda_3} v_1^2 \right)^2. \quad (21)$$

Therefore, if $\sqrt{\lambda_2 + \lambda_3} v_2^2 \neq \sqrt{\lambda_1 + \lambda_3} v_1^2$, we need

$$\lambda_3 \leq \sqrt{(\lambda_1 + \lambda_3)(\lambda_2 + \lambda_3)}. \quad (22)$$

If $\sqrt{\lambda_2 + \lambda_3} v_2^2 = \sqrt{\lambda_1 + \lambda_3} v_1^2$, choose

$$\Phi_1 = \frac{c}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\frac{\lambda_2 + \lambda_3}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_3} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Phi_2 = \frac{e^{i\rho}}{c\sqrt{2}} \left(\frac{\lambda_1 + \lambda_3}{\lambda_2 + \lambda_3} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v_1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (23)$$

with c real and get

$$V = \left[\left(1 + \frac{\lambda_3}{\sqrt{(\lambda_1 + \lambda_3)(\lambda_2 + \lambda_3)}} \right) \frac{(c-1)^4}{c^2} + \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_3}{\sqrt{(\lambda_1 + \lambda_3)(\lambda_2 + \lambda_3)}} \right) \frac{(c+1)^2(c-1)^2}{c^2} \right] \frac{\lambda_1 + \lambda_3}{8} v_1^4. \quad (24)$$

For $c \neq 1$ sufficiently close to 1, the second term dominates and again we need (22).

If $\lambda_1 + \lambda_3 = 0$ and/or $\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 = 0$, take

$$\Phi_1 = \frac{c}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Phi_2 = \frac{e^{i\rho}}{c\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v_2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (25)$$

with c real and get

$$V = (\lambda_1 + \lambda_3)(c^2 - 1)^2 \frac{v_1^4}{4} + (\lambda_2 + \lambda_3) \left(1 - \frac{1}{c^2}\right)^2 \frac{v_2^4}{4} - 2\lambda_3(c^2 - 1) \left(1 - \frac{1}{c^2}\right) \frac{v_1^2 v_2^2}{4}. \quad (26)$$

If $\lambda_1 + \lambda_3 > 0$ and $\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 = 0$ ($\lambda_1 + \lambda_3 = 0$ and $\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 > 0$), the last term in (26) is dominant for small enough (large enough) c^2 and $\lambda_3 \leq 0$, i.e. again (22), is necessary. For $\lambda_1 + \lambda_3 = \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 = 0$, any $c^2 \neq 0, 1$ leads to this conclusion. Therefore (22) is necessary in any case.

Vacuum stability requires V to be nonnegative for large fields, where dimension-two terms can be neglected. Keeping only quartic terms and writing $a \equiv \Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_1$, $b \equiv \Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_2$, $x \equiv \text{Re}(\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2)$, and $y \equiv \text{Im}(\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2)$, where the restrictions $a, b \geq 0$ and $x^2 + y^2 \leq ab$ apply, we get

$$V = (\lambda_1 + \lambda_3)a^2 + (\lambda_2 + \lambda_3)b^2 + (2\lambda_3 + \lambda_4)ab + (\lambda_5 - \lambda_4)x^2 + (\lambda_6 - \lambda_4)y^2. \quad (27)$$

For given ab , the sum of the last two terms is easily seen to have a minimum value of $(\lambda_< - \lambda_4)ab$, where $\lambda_<$ is defined as

$$\lambda_< \equiv \min(\lambda_4, \lambda_5, \lambda_6). \quad (28)$$

We therefore have to minimize

$$V = \left(\sqrt{\lambda_1 + \lambda_3}a - \sqrt{\lambda_2 + \lambda_3}b\right)^2 + \left(2\lambda_3 + \lambda_< + 2\sqrt{(\lambda_1 + \lambda_3)(\lambda_2 + \lambda_3)}\right)ab \quad (29)$$

in order to see if $V \geq 0$ for all large fields Φ_1, Φ_2 . It is easy to convince oneself that even if $\lambda_1 + \lambda_3 = 0$ and/or $\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 = 0$, (29) leads to the necessary condition

$$\lambda_3 \geq -\left(\lambda_</2 + \sqrt{(\lambda_1 + \lambda_3)(\lambda_2 + \lambda_3)}\right) \quad (30)$$

to prevent V from becoming negative for some large fields.

So far we have derived the necessary conditions (9), (12), (17), (19), (22), and (30). Now we will show that the same conditions are sufficient as well. For this

purpose, we will assume from now on that the necessary conditions are fulfilled. Note that one of the consequences is that V_{456} , i.e. the part of the potential involving $\lambda_{4,5,6}$, is never negative. The same is not necessarily true for the other part V_{123} of the potential.

If both $\lambda_1 + \lambda_3 > 0$ and $\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 > 0$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} V = & \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{\lambda_3}{\sqrt{(\lambda_1 + \lambda_3)(\lambda_2 + \lambda_3)}} \right) \left[\sqrt{\lambda_1 + \lambda_3} \left(\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_1 - \frac{v_1^2}{2} \right) + \sqrt{\lambda_2 + \lambda_3} \left(\Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_2 - \frac{v_2^2}{2} \right) \right]^2 \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_3}{\sqrt{(\lambda_1 + \lambda_3)(\lambda_2 + \lambda_3)}} \right) \left[\sqrt{\lambda_1 + \lambda_3} \left(\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_1 - \frac{v_1^2}{2} \right) - \sqrt{\lambda_2 + \lambda_3} \left(\Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_2 - \frac{v_2^2}{2} \right) \right]^2 \\ & + V_{456}. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Thus

$$|\lambda_3| \leq \sqrt{(\lambda_1 + \lambda_3)(\lambda_2 + \lambda_3)} \quad (32)$$

is sufficient to have $V_{123} \geq 0$. If $\lambda_1 + \lambda_3 = 0$ and/or $\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 = 0$, then manifestly $V_{123} \geq 0$ if (32) holds, i.e. if $\lambda_3 = 0$. Since $V_{456} \geq 0$, (32) is sufficient to have $V \geq 0$.

Define $x_1 \equiv \sqrt{\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_1} + v_1/\sqrt{2}$, $y_1 \equiv \sqrt{\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_1} - v_1/\sqrt{2}$, $x_2 \equiv \sqrt{\Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_2} + v_2/\sqrt{2}$, and $y_2 \equiv \sqrt{\Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_2} - v_2/\sqrt{2}$. Making use of the necessary conditions, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} V & \geq V_{123} + \lambda_< \left\{ (\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_1)(\Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_2) - (\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2)(\Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_1) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \left[\text{Re}(\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2) - \frac{v_1 v_2}{2} \cos \rho \right]^2 + \left[\text{Im}(\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2) - \frac{v_1 v_2}{2} \sin \rho \right]^2 \right\} \\ & = V_{123} + \lambda_< \left[(\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_1)(\Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_2) - 2 \text{Re} \left(\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2 e^{-i\rho} \frac{v_1 v_2}{2} \right) + \frac{v_1^2 v_2^2}{4} \right] \\ & \geq V_{123} + \lambda_< \left[\sqrt{(\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_1)(\Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_2)} - \frac{v_1 v_2}{2} \right]^2 \\ & = (\lambda_1 + \lambda_3) x_1^2 y_1^2 + (\lambda_2 + \lambda_3) x_2^2 y_2^2 + 2 \lambda_3 x_1 y_1 x_2 y_2 + \frac{\lambda_<}{4} [x_1 y_2 + x_2 y_1]^2 \\ & = \left(\sqrt{\lambda_1 + \lambda_3} x_1 y_1 - \sqrt{\lambda_2 + \lambda_3} x_2 y_2 \right)^2 \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{2} \left[\lambda_3 + \sqrt{(\lambda_1 + \lambda_3)(\lambda_2 + \lambda_3)} \right] (x_1 y_2 - x_2 y_1)^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$+\frac{1}{2}\left[\frac{\lambda_{<}}{2}+\lambda_3+\sqrt{(\lambda_1+\lambda_3)(\lambda_2+\lambda_3)}\right](x_1y_2+x_2y_1)^2. \quad (33)$$

Thus, obviously

$$-\left(\lambda_{<}/2+\sqrt{(\lambda_1+\lambda_3)(\lambda_2+\lambda_3)}\right)\leq\lambda_3\leq-\sqrt{(\lambda_1+\lambda_3)(\lambda_2+\lambda_3)} \quad (34)$$

is sufficient to have $V \geq 0$.

Combining (32) and (34), we get the new sufficient condition

$$-\left(\lambda_{<}/2+\sqrt{(\lambda_1+\lambda_3)(\lambda_2+\lambda_3)}\right)\leq\lambda_3\leq\sqrt{(\lambda_1+\lambda_3)(\lambda_2+\lambda_3)}. \quad (35)$$

However from (22) and (30) we already know that this is also necessary.

Let us summarize the bounds on the parameters in the potential that are both necessary and sufficient to ensure that $V \geq 0$ for all fields Φ_1 and Φ_2 , thereby ensuring vacuum stability and—up to possible degeneracy of different vacua—the desired symmetry breaking pattern. They are the remarkably simple conditions

$$\lambda_1+\lambda_3\geq 0, \quad \lambda_2+\lambda_3\geq 0, \quad \lambda_3\geq -\left[\frac{1}{2}\min(\lambda_4,\lambda_5,\lambda_6)+\sqrt{(\lambda_1+\lambda_3)(\lambda_2+\lambda_3)}\right], \quad (36)$$

$$\lambda_3\leq\sqrt{(\lambda_1+\lambda_3)(\lambda_2+\lambda_3)}, \quad \lambda_4\geq 0, \quad \lambda_5\geq 0, \quad \lambda_6\geq 0. \quad (37)$$

Using (3) and (5), these conditions can easily be translated to the case of nonzero λ_7 .

Now up to marginal cases, the quartic terms in the potential alone decide about vacuum stability. Then the first three conditions (36) follow from vacuum stability requirements, while the last four bounds (37) ensure the correct symmetry breaking pattern by the vacuum. This distinction is interesting because if the couplings are made running through the renormalization group, one does not want to loose vacuum stability of the two-doublet potential at scales before new physics comes in, while the other conditions are important only for small fields, and therefore their behavior at large scales through running is irrelevant.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported in part by the Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AT03-88ER 40383 Mod A006-Task C.

References

- [1] J.F. Gunion, H.E. Haber, G. Kane and S. Dawson, *The Higgs Hunter's Guide*, (Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1989), first edition.
- [2] M. Sher, Phys. Rep. 179 (1989) 273.
- [3] A.I. Bochkarev, S.V. Kuzmin and M.E. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Rev. D43 (1991) 369; Phys. Lett. B244 (1990) 275; N. Turok and J. Zadrozny, Phys. Rev. Lett. 65 (1990) 2331; Nucl. Phys. B358 (1991) 471; Nucl. Phys. B369 (1992) 729; M. Dine, P. Huet, R. Singleton Jr., and L. Susskind, Phys. Lett. B257 (1991) 351; L. McLerran, M. Shaposhnikov, N. Turok and M. Voloshin, Phys. Lett. B256 (1991) 451; B. Kastening, R.D. Peccei, and X. Zhang, Phys. Lett. B266 (1991) 413; A.G. Cohen, D.B. Kaplan, and A.E. Nelson, Phys. Lett. B263 (1991) 86; A.M. Kazarian, S.V. Kuzmin, and M.E. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Lett. B276 (1992) 131; A.E. Nelson, D.B. Kaplan, and A.G. Cohen, UCSD preprint UCSD/PTH 91-20 (1991); K.Y. Lee and J.K. Kim, KAIST preprint, KAIST-CHEP-92/T06 (1992).
- [4] H. Georgi, Hadronic Journal 1 (1978) 155.